

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS

Minutes - November 7, 1975

PRESENT:

Dean Campbell (Chairman), Professor B. Slack (Secretary)  
Assoc. Dean M. Armstrong  
Asst. Deans G. Mahoney and D. McKeen  
Chairmen: Professors M. Brian, D. Charlton, D. Frost, H. Hutter,  
A. Ketter, D. Laskey, D. McDonald, J. Stewart, G. Taggart, R. Wall,  
R. Yorkey  
Category I: Professors R. Angel, A. Jordan  
Category II: Professor J. Palmer  
Category III: Professors F. Krantz, M. Marsden, J. Zweig  
Category IV: Professors R. Diubaldo, N. Segalowitz, H. Shulman,  
A. Synnott  
Library Rep.: Mr. J. Princz  
Registrar: Mr. K. Adams  
Miss M. Osborne  
Students Reps.: Mr. D. Giggey, R. Grossman, T. Regan, G. Frampton,  
Ms. S. Toal  
Visitors: Professors J. Hill, B. Opala, J. Ornstein, S. Scheinberg  
Father Graham, Mr. T. Swift, D. Oancia  
Loyola Rep.: Mr. B. Rennie

ABSENT WITH APOLOGIES: Professor M. Farrell, Assoc. Vice-Rector D. McDougall,  
Professor P. Morley.

1. Approval of the Minutes of October 3, 1975

\* Professor Wall moved that the minutes of October 3, 1975 be  
accepted and this was seconded by Professor Jordan.

Professor Angel mentioned that on page 12 the word "espoused" which  
was attributed to him should be changed to "a student of".

Professor Slack noted that Professor McKeen wished to make corrections  
to the minutes on pages 7 and 11. On page 7 the sentence "He  
continued...select position" was an inaccurate reflection of what he  
had said as well as an inaccurate description of the composition of  
C.P.C. What in fact was said was that A.F.C. was a select group of  
chairmen and faculty members and that he suspected that the experience  
and capacity for useful work reflected there tended to mislead  
newcomers into assuming that all faculty members were regarded by  
their peers as equally qualified to serve on senior committees. With  
regard to page 11, the sentence "He suggested...basis of registration"  
should be revised to read: "He suggested that priority be given to  
the History Department in the first year of the offering of the  
Diploma, but that in the following two years they would, etc."

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.

3. Questions

Professor Krantz inquired as to the structuring of the Committee to select a Dean of Graduate Studies and queried the rationale of keeping the names of the nominees secret.

Dean Campbell stated that it was a broadly based Committee but he could not remember the exact number of members. The question of secrecy was based on a resolution adopted by Senate last year when a breach of confidentiality occurred within a search committee.

Professor Krantz indicated that he understood why confidentiality was necessary but indicated that if he wished to make representation to such a Committee he would need to know the names of the nominees.

Dean Campbell asserted that it was the usual practice to keep the names of the nominees secret. In the past, a number of Universities have lost very good candidates for a number of offices because they were not able to assure confidentiality. In one instance in particular at York University, when the names reached the press, most of the nominees refused to be considered further. Most applicants, he continued, hold positions in other universities and were/are not anxious for these Universities to know that they are applying elsewhere. Also, to allow their names to go forward and then be rejected could have consequences on their careers. If Council feels that this policy is unwise, Dean Campbell added, he would take it forward to Senate.

Professor Krantz then pointed out that it had not been clear to faculty members that the nominations were closed as of last Friday.

Professor Marsden interjected that he had spoken to Professor Whitelaw who had stated that a notice had been inserted in "For Your Information" and in University Affairs, however Professor Marsden had seen neither. He also said that a letter had been sent to faculty members before closing but that he had only received his two days before the deadline.

Professor Stewart wondered if it would be possible to be taken into the confidence of the Search Committee to find out who the nominees were.

Dean Campbell commented that it would be interesting to see what would happen in this case and he supposed that one would have to sign a pledge of confidentiality. He took this opportunity to say that many faculty members have been disturbed by stories in "For Your Information" and "Extra", and that this Faculty has been exposed to ridicule and gross misrepresentation. He continued that this academic bias was very hard to justify in a University publication. He mentioned that he had notified the editor that the Faculty of Arts did not wish to be reported on in these papers until it could be assumed that the quality of reporting had improved.

Professor Charlton commented on the matter of Honorary Degrees and stated that a resolution had been passed at the Fine Arts Faculty Council meeting that morning. He asked if Council could debate this issue.

Dean Campbell agreed that it was a matter to be discussed but suggested that it might be better to deal first with the business involving the special guests who had been invited to this Council meeting.

Mr. Rennie noted that it was reported in the Loyola news that the philosophy of the two papers, FYI and Extra, was discussed at a recent meeting of the Deans. He asked Dean Campbell if this was so.

Dean Campbell replied that it had been discussed.

Dean Campbell then recommended that Council move to item 5a.

5a. Admissions Policy (AFC 756-3-D1)

Dean Campbell introduced Father Graham, Mr. Swift and Mr. Adams who had been invited to this Council meeting as a result of a debate at the September meeting.

Mr. Shulman asked Mr. Swift if he was satisfied with the co-ordination of the Admission procedures.

Mr. Swift began by giving a historical perspective. At first the basic Admissions requirements and procedures were co-ordinated. Admissions requirements have to be reviewed on a continuing basis and he noted that a review of the performance of students was also necessary. To further coordinate the Admissions policies, an overview of the offices was needed. On visiting the Loyola Admissions Office, he noticed that there were a great number (147 cases in 3 drawers) of conditional acceptances sent to applicant on the basis of their application alone and before any further documentation including transcripts had arrived. This is not the practice at Sir George and he indicated that the interpretation of the policy must be the same in both departments if the merger is to be a success.

Professor Shulman asked Mr. Swift if he would favor two Admissions Offices.

Mr. Swift answered that personally he would favor one Admissions Office because there were 1500 duplicate applicants last year. However, if the University decides to have two Admissions Offices then the matter of co-ordination becomes very important.



Assoc. Dean Armstrong asked Father Graham if there is a co-ordinated Admissions policy, because although she understood there to be a common policy, the events of the Fall had cast doubts in her mind.

Father Graham replied that they would have to distinguish between policy and the application of the policy. The policy itself is set by Senate whereas the application of this policy is done through the Admissions Offices. The matter of having two Admissions Offices is partly historical and partly due to the strong emotional feelings on both campuses at this time which make it necessary to have two Admissions Offices. He did feel though that the administration of the policies could be co-ordinated and that Mr. Swift had been appointed for this reason.

Mr. Swift noted that his mandate as co-ordinator included two points, one being that he act as external representative and the other that he make a study of the procedures on the two campuses. He said that he has been asking for over a year for a more precise definition of the mandate but has never received it.

Mr. Adams added that he designated Mr. Swift as co-ordinator as a staff function and that Mr. Swift had no jurisdiction over the actual implementation of co-ordination. Instead the role of the co-ordinator was one of conducting a study.

Mr. Swift commented that the position of co-ordinator of Concordia Admissions was very vague.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong asked Father Graham if the need for two Admissions Offices was something that applied only to the present or whether the University might be coming to the point where it would need only one Admissions Office.

Father Graham answered in the affirmative stating that a number of things have been done already in this direction, for example much progress has been made in arriving at one computer operation for both campuses and he was now in the process of trying to complete the study of the other areas of admissions as soon as possible.

Professor Marsden commented that Mr. Swift was now in a very delicate position and that it was not fair to direct questions to him on matters of opinion.

Dean Campbell stated that questions have never been censured in Council but that there were no powers which could compel an individual to answer.

Mr. Swift replied that this was a University and that if he could not speak his mind then he would rather not be here.

Professor McDonald noted that it would be very unfortunate if the University went through another year without a co-ordinated policy.

Father Graham added that a co-ordinated policy will come.

Professor Stewart noted that while Senate is responsible for establishing the admissions policies, there are matters relating to the requirements for admission of a student that do not come from Senate. She claimed that it was in this latter area that the problems existed.

Mr. Adams spoke of three stages that have occurred in the co-ordination of the Admissions policies. The first was the actual fusion of the Policy which went through Senate twice; the second was the publication of the 1975/76 Concordia University undergraduate calendar which included only one Admissions section; and the third was the stage which includes internal operational readjustment that is being handled this year.

Dean Campbell remarked that there was a basic Admissions policy throughout the province regarding the certification of collegial studies. If this has been completed then the University may apply aptitude tests or as in the case of certain departments, quotas, but the basic academic requirements are the same. Beyond that comes the evaluation of the certificates from other provinces and countries. Then there is the alternative routes to admission, the MSQP program for example, and here the University differs from other institutions. He suggested that it might be in the best interests of the Faculty to have different positions on certain matters.

Professor Shulman expressed concern over the application of the common set of standards and stated that he would like the discussion to revert back to his original concern.

Father Graham stated that he felt the matter had been gone into far enough. A misunderstanding had arisen which could be ascribed to growing pains. He continued that he had made efforts to correct the particular problem and to the best of his knowledge, it had been corrected.

Dean Campbell indicated that the uppermost issues seem to be the letter sent from Loyola campus concerning conditional acceptance, the matter of the delay difference between formal application and a letter of acceptance of Loyola and Sir George, and the fact that some departments at Loyola were confused over the application form and had told students that to fill out one would be enough to apply to both campuses.

Professor Shulman noted that the sequence of events were disturbing in that the confusion of the implementation of the Admissions Policy was followed by a letter from Mr. Swift stating his unhappiness with this situation which in turn was followed by Mr. Adams being relieved of his jurisdiction over the Sir George Admissions Office. Mr. Swift was then told to report directly to Father Graham. He commented that there were certain academic implications of the reorganization of the Registrar's Office given the sequence of events.



Father Graham explained that the sequence of events had nothing to do with the changes. The internal reorganization had been discussed for some time and had nothing to do with any allegations. He continued that the actual reorganization was an administrative matter and not a policy matter and that the offices were in no way changed. He noted that the actual work had not changed only the reporting aspect of it. He had consulted with Dr. Smola who gave him his full approval. He regarded the reorganization as a promotion with respect to the Admissions Officers and Liaison Officers in that they were now afforded an opportunity to report directly at the Vice-Rector's level. Father Graham said that he considered himself not a Registrar, nor an Admissions Officer, nor a Liaison Officer but rather a Co-ordinator at the Vice-Rector's level. Each week an attempt is made to hold a meeting which gives an opportunity for a review of the problems of the officers who report to him. He again distinguished between policy, which is set by Senate and procedure, which is set by the Administration. Father Graham stated that the advantage of this reorganization is that it brings the Admissions Office, Liaison Office and Registrar's Office into closer contact with him and the administrative structure as a whole. He added that he will carry out the policy as brought down by Senate and that it will be the same on each campus. He assured Council that much time has been given to the problem in the Admissions Office and that to the best of his knowledge it is now solved.

Mr. Adams said that he would comment on the Admission Office to the point where his responsibility ended. He had asked Mr. Swift to carry out a study on the co-ordination of policies. When Mr. Swift had reported to him on the discrepancies he had brought them to the attention of his superior.

Professor Shulman asked Mr. Adams for his reaction to the reorganization instituted by Father Graham.

Mr. Adams stated that it was beneficial for him to come closer to the Vice-Rector and that the only difference in his position was that he no longer had Admissions or Liaison reporting to him.

On being asked the same question, Mr. Swift replied that efforts had been made to ensure co-ordination but somehow they had broken down. At Sir George, early acceptances were based on receipt of the CEGEP transcript whereas at Loyola a letter would be sent out acknowledging application and indicating a conditional acceptance before the transcript arrived. Thus at Loyola a conditional acceptance would be mailed to the student within 24 hours whereas at Sir George up at 6 weeks was involved. He continued that a common procedure had been agreed to but it was not carried through at Loyola, hence his annoyance.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong commented that a key problem was the public image and that this method of conditional acceptance by Loyola provided a tremendous advantage over Sir George. She asked Father Graham whether this has been co-ordinated or whether Loyola still has a competitive edge.

Father Graham responded that the problem had been solved to the best of his knowledge. He continued that acceptance could mean various things and could be defined in more than one way. The general idea was to give applicants more than an acknowledgement and this stemmed from the traditional practice of Loyola.

Asst. Dean McKeen asked if there was a Senate policy document on Admissions.

Father Graham indicated that the document per se would include an accumulation of all that Senate passes on Admissions.

Asst. Dean McKeen asked if the policy included a statement on receipt of a transcript before conditional acceptance.

Mr. Swift answered that there was reference to this in the Admission regulations in the calendar which specifically states that the transcript must be seen before conditional acceptance can be granted

Asst. Dean McKeen said that he understood the emotional and traditional differences between the two Admissions Offices but last year's calendar spoke uniformly and it was clear that the transcript must be seen before conditional acceptance could be sent. He asked Father Graham if he had figures on the percentage of students who had conditionally been accepted in this matter and then admitted.

Father Graham said that this would entail a large study to get the exact number of people. However he felt that the number of students who were admitted in September seems comparable with last year's total.

Professor Marsden stated that Father Graham had spoken clearly on his attitude concerning the rearrangement of the Registrar's office however he felt that by bringing the officers closer to the administrative level it had separated them and that by taking them a step higher had caused a separation of groups that were formerly more unified.

Father Graham indicated that he disagreed with this view.

Professor Wall noted that Father Graham had suggested that by bringing these officers closer to his level he might know more of what was happening in these departments. However, all of Father Graham's answers have included "to the best of my knowledge". Professor Wall wondered when Council would have more definite answers to the questions raised.



Father Graham replied that he would send a definite answer in writing.

Professor Krantz asked if conditional acceptance will continue in terms of receipt of transcript.

Father Graham said that a kit is being prepared to go out to students which will be exactly the same for both campuses and includes one admissions form and one booklet which defines what the student must do.

Professor Krantz then asked if Mr. Adams was an Admissions Officer or simply the Registrar.

Mr. Adams stated that he was the Registrar but no longer was responsible for Admissions or Liaison.

Professor Krantz queried Father Graham as to why he took over Mr. Adams' functions.

Father Graham replied that it was a question of administrative structuring.

Professor Krantz noted that Senate makes the policies while the administration carries them out and he questioned the relation of this Council to the creation of Admissions policies in Senate.

Dean Campbell stated that the normal procedure would be for a document concerning admissions to reach Senate usually through the Registrar's office, although it might also come from the Senate Steering Committee or an individual. Action is then taken by Senate and a motion may be made to refer the document to the Faculty Councils for opinion and then returned to Senate. The administration is accountable to Senate for the implementation of the policy and this practice must coincide with integrity to the policy. The practice has been that this Council is the proper forum for discussing any issue touching on the University. It was never felt that it was improper for Council to express itself on anything and that Council's view would go forward to Senate.

Professor Krantz indicated that it was possible then for Senate and the government to make a policy without consulting Arts Faculty Council. He continued that the articles of merger included two separate Arts Faculties and that this Council has never given assent to any unifying policy, procedure, etc. He was not convinced that uniformity was such a good thing as there might be different requirements for the two Arts Faculties.

Dean Campbell mentioned that generally the feeling in Senate has been towards establishing uniform procedures between the campuses. Nevertheless the matter could be discussed in this Council and the discussions forwarded to Senate.



Professor Krantz commented that the automatic acceptance of applicants without transcripts even in a conditional sense is academically indefensible and he felt that Council should make a statement clearly indicating that this practice should not continue.

Professor Brian remarked that the matter was not that Loyola might have enrolled more students but that at Loyola the persons responsible for admissions had deviated from an agreed procedure. He then asked if this practice had occurred before or after the co-ordination with Loyola, and when exactly was the unified policy decided upon.

Mr. Swift answered that the unified policy was agreed to in September or October 1974 when he and Mr. Adams met with a Loyola representative to go over the matter of conditional acceptances. Every point was gone over in detail and was agreed to by all those in attendance. The result of this meeting was the publication of 13.7.1 in the 1975/76 joint calendar, the statement of Admissions Policy.

Professor Brian queried as to whether the offering of immediate conditional acceptances was a continuation or a change in policy.

Father Graham stated that it was his understanding that it was a continuation. He understood that the letter sent out was not a formal acceptance, since no one was admitted until he had completed the admission requirements.

Professor Brian asked who was responsible for notifying Loyola that the policy on conditional acceptances should change.

Mr. Adams repeated that when the meeting was held, the whole document was gone through section by section and the Loyola representative agreed to this common practice. The fault, he continued, might lie with himself for accepting in good faith that the procedure would be implemented.

Mr. Regan asked if Loyola had received the transcripts including marks for the first three CEGEP semesters before the conditional acceptances were issued.

Mr. Swift repeated that the conditional acceptances in question were sent out on the basis of the receipt of the application form alone and no further documentation.

Mr. Rennie summarized the discussion to this point by stating that three problems had been presented: acceptance without documentation, restructuring of personnel, and a common admissions policy.

Professor Zweig asked if any of the 147 cases of acceptance had been revoked.

Father Graham reiterated that conditional acceptances only were sent out.

Professor Angel said that if this discussion is to serve a useful purpose, it is important to point out that a serious charge has been laid. In effect it is that there has been a breach of good faith yet Father Graham refers to it simply as a misunderstanding.

Father Graham reiterated that it was a misunderstanding.

Professor Angel continued that he has had occasion to deal with members of the Loyola community and he felt profoundly that good faith had been breached on a particular occasion, which he had been assured was a misunderstanding. He felt that if the merger was to be a success in all areas, such misunderstandings would have to be scrupulously avoided.

Father Graham agreed.

At this point the discussion ceased and Father Graham thanked Council for listening to him and assured Council that he would listen to anyone who has or wishes to discuss difficulties.

Dean Campbell thanked those invited, Mr. Adams, Father Graham and Mr. Swift, for attending and enlightening Council on these problems.

8. Graduate Studies Report (AFC 756-3-D2)

Assoc. Dean Armstrong introduced Professor Hill to Council and asked him to present the report.

Professor Hill began by saying that it was a pleasure to present this report on graduate changes to Council. He then proceeded point by point through the document giving reasons and explanations for each of the changes.

Professor Brian asked if the changes in the M.A. Educational Studies program incurred any further resources.

Professor McKeen asserted that the report had been brought to APC and that no resource implications could be seen.

\* Assoc. Dean Armstrong moved adoption of the report, seconded by Professor Charlton.

The Question was called on the motion and CARRIED.



Assoc. Dean Armstrong thanked the members of CPC who worked on this report especially those who do not serve on Council, Professors Hill and Ornstein.

Dean Campbell called a question on proceeding with other items on the agenda before discussing the matter of Honorary Degrees. Council AGREED.

4. Business Arising out of Meeting of October 3rd:  
Student Representation on CPC

Professor Slack announced that the procedures for electing student representatives would be identical to the electing of faculty members. He continued that he has already written to the student associations involved requesting nominations and that hopefully Steercom will be able to peruse these recommendations and present nominations to Council at the December meeting.

7. Honorary Degree Nominations

Dean Campbell noted that the decision for Honorary Degree candidates will now originate in the Faculties and go forward to Senate.

6. Nominations: Two scrutineers

Dean Campbell stated that it was Council's responsibility to appoint two scrutineers for the Arts Faculty Council elections.

Professor Slack said that it was Steercom's recommendation to appoint Professor Zweig and Mr. Grossman.

\* Assoc. Dean Armstrong moved that nominations close, seconded by Professor Jordan. The motion was CARRIED and Professor Zweig and Mr. Grossman were declared elected.

5b. Membership of Council

Professor Slack reminded Council of the decision taken last year to reduce to three the categories of elected faculty members. As a result, Category I now comprised Associate and Full Professors in the Humanities, Category II consisted of Associate and Full Professors in the Social Sciences and Category III embraced all Lecturers and Assistant Professors in the Arts Faculty. Each category would comprise five members. In fact the current strength comprised 3 in Category I, 4 in Category II and 6 in Category III. Elections were necessary therefore, but instead of waiting for the normal terms of members of Category III to expire, Steercom recommended shifting Professor Palmer into Category I because he has been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor since his election.

Professor Slack moved that Professor Palmer be accepted to Category I and elections be held for one member each to Categories II and III. Professor Jordan seconded the motion.

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.

ii)

Professor Slack introduced the request made by the Fine Arts Faculty that a Fine Arts representative be allowed to sit on Arts Faculty Council.

Professor Krantz stated that he had no objection to an observer but would object to the member from Fine Arts having voting rights.

Mr. Rennie noted that this question had been discussed at a meeting of the Arts and Science Faculty Council of Loyola and it was decided that if a member were given voting rights, it would prove an added incentive for this person to attend and participate in meetings.

Professor Wall asked for the number of elected members to Council in relation to those who are there because of their position.

Professor Slack answered that there were 11 student representatives 15 department chairmen and 15 elected faculty.

Professor Wall stated that if Council continued to add liaison people with votes then it could very well turn out that the number of elected people will be in the minority.

Professor Angel indicated his support for Professor Krantz's views. He remarked that a situation could arise where the member from the other Faculty could cast the deciding vote on a matter of extreme importance.

Professor Brian added that this could be said of our representative on the Fine Arts Faculty Council.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong noted that many programs in Fine Arts affect the Arts Faculty and vice versa. She felt that it was important that the representative be a full voting member.

Dean Campbell said that because of the relationships of the two Faculties it would be appropriate for the Fine Arts Faculty to have membership on Council.

Professor Brian repeated his argument that if an Arts representative sits on the Fine Arts Faculty Council with voting rights, this should be reciprocated.

Professor Stewart inquired whether the Fine Arts Faculty itself asked for a representative from Arts.



Dean Campbell said that at meetings between members of the then Department of Fine Arts and the Arts Faculty it was recommended that representation be continued within the Faculties of Arts, Fine Arts and Loyola.

- \* Mr. Regan moved that one seat be added on Arts Faculty Council for a member of the Fine Arts Faculty. This was seconded by Professor Frost.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong said that with regard to the voting question it may be better to table the motion until new rules could be developed.

Mr. Regan stated that the issue is clear cut -- that there is already a member from Arts Faculty Council on the Fine Arts Faculty Council who has full voting rights, and that this collusion between the two faculties should continue. To grant this person voting rights is to grant recognition of the importance of Fine Arts.

The question was called on the motion and LOST.

- \* Professor Krantz moved that the Chairman inform Senate of Council's feeling regarding admitting a liaison person from the Faculty of Fine Arts who would not have voting rights. Professor McKeen seconded the motion.

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.

iii)

Professor Slack indicated that Council had been approached with the view of exchanging voting members with the Loyola Arts and Science Faculty Council. Steercom proposed either Professor Shulman or Professor Jordan.

As a result of the ballot Professor Shulman was elected as representative to the Loyola Faculty of Arts and Science Council.

Mr. Rennie commented that the Loyola meetings are held on a rotating basis and that the next meeting would be Monday, November 10th at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room.

Professor Jordan asked if it would be possible to, at times, suggest an alternate member.

Dean Campbell answered that there was no provision for an alternate member.

5c. Student Request Committee Report (AFC 756-2-D4)

Asst. Dean Mahoney introduced the report saying that it was a statement with raw data of the activities of the Student Request Committee. In the past year the Committee has had requests for student participation in the meeting and he has found this a useful technique. He also said that Mr. Grossman has now joined the Committee as student representative.

Professor Marsden expressed concern with the way students use the privileges of the Request Committee and that some abuses were occurring. For instance, many overloads are being granted and some students are fairing very badly.

Asst. Dean Mahoney answered that it was sometimes difficult to make the correct judgement but no more than one course overload is ever granted. By the same token many students have taken overloads and have received good grades in all the courses taken.

Professor Diubaldo queried the basis for granting students permission to take graduate courses for undergraduate credit.

Ms. Osborne stated that this was seldom done. However, the cases approved were always supported by a letter from the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Professor Angel questioned the Committee granting permission for Portuguese N441 to be considered as part of a Spanish Joint Major in that he thought this was under departmental control. He continued that he thought it was under the jurisdiction of the Majors' advisor to make such decisions.

\* Professor Jordan moved that the report be adopted. The motion was seconded by Professor Stewart.

Professor Zweig queried why a student would be allowed to register a third time for credit in Psychology N412.

Mr. Giggey stated that if a student were allowed to register for as few courses as he wanted then why could a student not register for as many as he wished and then assess his ability to handle his course load as late in the term as he felt necessary.

Dean Campbell said that it was basically a question of commitment and it would be difficult balancing the interests of the other students who made a similar commitment and then failed the course.

Asst. Dean Mahoney commented that over the years the deadline for withdrawals has been getting later and later.

Professor Angel indicated that one aspect of withdrawal without penalty would be to make a mockery of compulsory examinations.

Professor Diubaldo pointed out that taken to the extreme, a student could go into the exam room, look at the exam and then decide to withdraw.

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.



5d. Request from the Part-time Students Association for a Rescheduling of Council meetings

Professor Slack noted that a letter had been received from the Part-time Students Association concerning the rescheduling of Council meetings in order that their representatives may attend.

Mr. Giggey remarked that a recent election in the Part-time Students Association had to be cancelled due to lack of participation and interest.

Professor Marsden noted that the University offers theoretical privileges and rights to students and then makes it difficult for them to obtain them. He felt that Council should show consideration for these evening students and have either alternate meetings or request companies to release students for the purpose of attending meetings.

Ms. Toal, the Evening Students Representative, said that any meeting held before 4:00 P.M. makes it virtually impossible for evening students to attend.

Professor Brian commented that the evening students are an integral part of the University and that they are at a disadvantage so continuously that he is not surprised with the apathy displayed by them and anything done to rectify this matter would be to our advantage.

Dean Campbell indicated that as it was the general principle to hold meetings on Friday afternoons, the logical evening alternate would be Friday evening.

- \* Mr. Regan moved that a request be sent to employers asking that part-time student representatives be released in order that they may be able to attend the Council meetings. The motion was seconded by Professor Jordan.

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.

- \* Professor Marsden moved that Steercom be asked to produce a recommendation that will facilitate the active performance of part-time members of Council should the first motion prove ineffective. This was seconded by Professor Charlton.

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.

9. Representation of the Psychology Department Chairman on Science Faculty Council

Professor Slack mentioned that Science Faculty Council had suggested that the Chairman of the Department of Psychology should be represented on that body.

Professor Stewart presumed the reason for the request was that many courses in Psychology are crosslisted in Science. She indicated that she was not opposed to sitting on Science Faculty Council, however she had no strong feelings one way or the other.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong stated that this situation was similar to that of Economics on Commerce Faculty Council.

\*

Assoc. Dean Armstrong moved approving in principle that the Chairman of Psychology sit on Science Faculty Council. Mr. Giggey seconded the motion.

The question was called on the motion and CARRIED.

10. Other Business

a)

Professor Charlton said that in light of the earlier discussion and with reference to statements made on CBC, he felt that Concordia University had been made a subject of ridicule in the awarding of an Honorary Degree to Mr. Azrieli. He continued that this also destroyed the credibility of the Honorary Degrees and wanted to know if AFC supported the granting of this degree or not. That morning the Fine Arts Faculty Council passed a motion unanimously deploring the granting of the Honorary Degree to Mr. Azrieli and instructed their Secretary to inform the Administration, the Board of Governors and the media of the motion.

Professor McDonald asked if anyone in Council had actually seen a copy of the citation.

Professor Brian read what he thought was a copy of the citation in the Georgian.

Dean Campbell commented that the decision to award an Honorary Degree is made by Senate but the citation is developed afterwards and is not necessarily approved by Senate.

Professor McDonald reiterated that before he could pass judgement he would need more documentation.

Dean Campbell said that the decision to award the Degree was made in a closed meeting of Senate. He suggested it would be improper to discuss in Council the substance of the arguments presented in Senate.

Professor Wall argued that the question of confidentiality applied only until the announcement appeared.

Professor Angel argued that it was a closed meeting and that everything discussed was confidential.



Dean Campbell then questioned whether a closed meeting of Senate was closed to all who are not on Senate. Senate alone could decide this, he argued, and therefore statements made in Council must be confined to those points which were made public.

Professor Angel mentioned that when he first learned of the recommendation that Mr. Azrieli receive an Honorary Degree he was, like so many others, appalled. In the light of the ensuing discussion in Senate however, he was persuaded that his initial feeling was simply a moral pretention. He continued that he felt it would be outrageous if Council passed a motion similar to the one passed in Fine Arts Faculty Council and did not at the same time return the \$250,000. donated to the University by Mr. Azrieli.

Professor Krantz noted that aside from the destruction of the Van Horne mansion, which was not a felony, there were no other serious grounds for denying him the degree. In fact, statements in the Georgian point to the work he has done with children with learning disabilities and to the numerous contributions he has made to Sir George.

Dean Campbell stated that he was in no position to account for the man's life. As a member of Senate he voted in favor of awarding the degree because he was convinced that he was a person who had made substantial contributions to the University over a number of years. He continued that he had been aware of the issue of the mansion and was sensitive to the public's feelings on this. He felt that the government was most responsible for this outrage. He hoped that by moving the selection of Honorary Degree candidates to the Faculties it would result in future candidates being considered more on academic grounds.

Mr. Regan felt that Mr. Azrieli's responsibility for tearing down the Van Horne mansion was not sufficient for denying him an Honorary Degree. The problem he suggested was that Mr. Azrieli had asked for the degree and thus it appears that the degree went to the highest bidder. The DSA had moved the previous night and the Fine Arts Faculty Council moved earlier that day to express their feelings publicly. He felt that Arts Faculty Council should also make itself clear on this matter.

Dean Campbell answered that this University is not in the practice of selling Honorary Degrees and this was certainly not done in this case. The Honorary Degree is used as a device to honor individuals who have contributed to the University, whether these contributions be in the form of money, effort or time.

Professor Krantz noted that Mr. Azrieli's action in destroying a building was not immoral and was certainly within the law. The other issue of the University selling the Honorary Degree could not be supported in that the University has traditionally given this degree to benefactors who have made outstanding contributions to the University in one way or another. It is obvious that Mr. Azrieli is a benefactor of the University and maybe it was natural for him to expect some honor.

Dean Campbell stated that any motion must be directed to Senate as it is there where the responsibility lies, and he would feel as a member of Senate, that any motion should specify that.

Professor Wall indicated that as a Senator he shared the same feeling which Professor Angel had expressed. He also had initial reservations and concerns but realized that the man was a benefactor of the University and as a result of his donations, some graduate students are being supported in their graduate work. If we do not wish to honor this benefactor then we should not accept his money.

Mr. Giggey noted that the University cannot afford to turn down the money and should therefore award the degree, however if the University is awarding him the degree for his financial contributions then the citation should reflect this.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong agreed that the citation should refer to contributions to the University. He is certainly the first large donor to this University but not the first who has tried to raise funds and the citation should explain that he is important for that reason.

Professor Scheinberg expressed the feeling that the emphasis was being placed on the character of the individual who received the degree whereas perhaps it lay with those who awarded it. If stones are to be cast, they should be at Senate and not Mr. Azrieli who is a generous benefactor. The Senate has picked a man who, for one reason or another, has become a symbol of the wrecker's ball to the Montreal community and even to the nation. By awarding him this degree the University has needlessly given Mr. Azrieli offense.

Professor Brian agreed with Professor Scheinberg and stated that it was morally wrong to point the finger of scorn at this one man and that Senate acted in a gauche manner by embarrassing the University community and Mr. Azrieli in this way because of what he symbolizes at this time.

Professor Stewart stated that she felt the University community was angry at the manner in which Senate chose an inopportune time to honor this man and it shows that the University is as politically inept now as it was when the new name was selected.

Professor Marsden said that he was shocked that the Fine Arts Faculty Council released their displeasure to the press because the University will definitely not gain by this. Our Honorary Degrees are supposed to reflect ourselves and our hopes, and to show integrity, belief and direction. They are not usually handed out as blatantly as it appears to have been done in this case. This institution is drifting into a lifestyle which he does not respect. He expressed serious displeasure with the ineptness of our administrative officers and Senate and suggested that we not support them.



Professor Charlton moved that the Arts Faculty Council of Sir George campus deplores the granting of the Honorary Degree to Mr. Azrieli and instructs the Secretary of Council to notify Senate of this decision.

Professor Marsden suggested that the motion read "...and deplores the manner in which the degree was granted..."

Dean Campbell stated that the motion should be directed to the Senate and should not refer to Mr. Azrieli.

Professor Brian moved that Arts Faculty Council chides the Senate and the Administration for their gaucheness regarding the manner and timing of the award of an Honorary Degree to Mr. Azrieli which has caused embarrassment to the University and the recipient.

Professor Angel noted that this action is far more cynical than any action taken by Senate, as it suggests that Senate should do its dirty work under the table.

\*

Professor Marsden moved that the Arts Faculty Council deplores the failure of the Senate to truly represent the spirit of the community and the ineptitude of the Senate and the Administration for embarrassing the University and Mr. Azrieli in the matter of awarding the Honorary Degree. Professor Charlton seconded the motion.

The question was called on the motion and LOST.

Professor McKeen commented on the naivety of the outside world with regard to the awarding of honorary degrees. The University had in fact been planning to honor Mr. Azrieli for some time before the Van Horne mansion came down. The ineptness lies with the Administrative Officers for their handling of this situation.

Dean Campbell suggested that the minutes of this meeting be sent to Senate.

b)

Professor Shulman stated that he was not satisfied with the responses of Father Graham and he was not sure how to proceed from this point. He asked if Council was satisfied.

Professor McDonald did not feel that he could deal with the problem in that it seemed as if Council had set up a hearing Committee within an administrative structure other than the Faculty of Arts. He agreed that the issues were important and expressed his dissatisfaction with the meeting.



Professor Shulman felt that we should forward some sense of this meeting to Senate for the purpose of discussion.

Professor Marsden suggested asking Senate to call for a deadline on the implementation of procedures rather than policy.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong queried challenging the Vice-Rector's statement regarding administrative reorganization and suggested that the question be sent to the Rector rather than to Senate.

Dean Campbell stated that there is no question that an error was made and he wanted to be sure that such errors do not happen again.

Professor Shulman reiterated that he would prefer the matter be brought up as a Faculty concern rather than being left to an individual to raise this question again in Senate.

Dean Campbell acknowledged the fact that this Faculty was upset. He was not willing to accept what had occurred and wanted reassurance from the Vice-Rector that this would not happen again.

Professor Stewart noted that one problem which has arisen from the administrative reorganization is that Council is now denied direct representation from the central person who could supply it with information on admission policies since the Registrar is no longer responsible for the Admissions Office.

Dean Campbell asked if it was the wish of Council that these positions be stated in Senate as he will present them.

Council was unanimously in favor.

Assoc. Dean Armstrong moved that the meeting adjourn, seconded by Professor Krantz. CARRIED.